



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/735,697	12/12/2000	Noel Lee	P1230	6750
7590 01/27/2009				
LaRIVIERE, GRUBMAN & PAYNE, LLP P.O. BOX 3140 MONTEREY,, CA 93942			EXAMINER	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 01/27/2009

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Notification of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief</b> <b>(37 CFR 41.37)</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/735,697	<b>Applicant(s)</b> LEE, NOEL	
	<b>Examiner</b> DEBERADINIS, ROBERT	<b>Art Unit</b> 2836	

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--**

The Appeal Brief filed on 09 March 2006 is defective for failure to comply with one or more provisions of 37 CFR 41.37.

To avoid dismissal of the appeal, applicant must file an amended brief or other appropriate correction (see MPEP 1205.03) within **ONE MONTH or THIRTY DAYS** from the mailing date of this Notification, whichever is longer.  
**EXTENSIONS OF THIS TIME PERIOD MAY BE GRANTED UNDER 37 CFR 1.136.**

1. ☒ The brief does not contain the items required under 37 CFR 41.37(c), or the items are not under the proper heading or in the proper order.
2. ☐ The brief does not contain a statement of the status of all claims, (e.g., rejected, allowed, withdrawn, objected to, canceled), or does not identify the appealed claims (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(iii)).
3. ☐ At least one amendment has been filed subsequent to the final rejection, and the brief does not contain a statement of the status of each such amendment (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(iv)).
4. ☐ (a) The brief does not contain a concise explanation of the subject matter defined in each of the independent claims involved in the appeal, referring to the specification by page and line number and to the drawings, if any, by reference characters; and/or (b) the brief fails to: (1) identify, for each independent claim involved in the appeal and for each dependent claim argued separately, every means plus function and step plus function under 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph, and/or (2) set forth the structure, material, or acts described in the specification as corresponding to each claimed function with reference to the specification by page and line number, and to the drawings, if any, by reference characters (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(v)).
5. ☐ The brief does not contain a concise statement of each ground of rejection presented for review (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(vi)).
6. ☐ The brief does not present an argument under a separate heading for each ground of rejection on appeal (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(vii)).
7. ☐ The brief does not contain a correct copy of the appealed claims as an appendix thereto (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(viii)).
8. ☐ The brief does not contain copies of the evidence submitted under 37 CFR 1.130, 1.131, or 1.132 or of any other evidence entered by the examiner **and relied upon by appellant in the appeal**, along with a statement setting forth where in the record that evidence was entered by the examiner, as an appendix thereto (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(ix)).
9. ☒ The brief does not contain copies of the decisions rendered by a court or the Board in the proceeding identified in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of the brief as an appendix thereto (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(x)).
10. ☐ Other (including any explanation in support of the above items):

See Continuation Sheet.

/Sharmalla Coates/  
 Sharmalla Coates, Supervisor  
 Patent Patent Center

Item 1. The office has no record of an Appeal Brief filed December 19, 2005. A copy of this Appeal Brief is needed to complete the office records. /

Item 8. The corrected Appeal Brief filed 3/9/06 is not compliant because there are several documents missing from the Evidence Appendix section of the Appeal Brief. The following items are missing: Declarations for Noel Lee, Karen Johnson, and Albert Mehrabian filed December 20, 2000. Copies of the several articles are also missing discussed in the Appeal Brief.

Further is noted that the "Evidence Appendix" in the Appeal Brief ends on page 43, but the "Related Proceedings Appendix" in the Supplemental Appeal Brief filed April 27, 2006, begins on page 52. Clarification is required regarding the status of pages 44-51. The entire new brief is not and should not be filed. Rather, a paper providing a revised "Evidence Appendix" will suffice .